12/19/2004 Date:

First Name: Brian Last Name: Webb

10505 Caminito Glenellen Address:

City: San Diego

CA State:

Zip Code: 92126

Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis, Transportation Topic:

Comments: BHPB is using state-of-the-art technologies to tranport a much needed

energy sorce to California. The process of converting the liquid form to gas has been safely done for over 40 years. As well the floating port also

proves safe as it moves with the waves in the ocean and the boats

docking at the structure. This greatly reduces the chances of a boat being knocked against a solid structure. All things combined this project seems to exceed safety requirements, and offer a real energy solution to our state. Environmentalists who don't support the project are making a stretch trying to convence citizens of the dangers of Cabrillo Port.

2004/G208

G208-1

Comment Form—Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port draft EIS/EIR	
Name (Please Print): KOBERT WEBB	Source: Public Meeting - Oxnard PM
Organization/Agency:	Date: 11/30/2004
Street Address: 1229 W. Douglas AVE	
	Zip Code: 93030
Email address:	
Please provide written comments in the space below and drop th	is form into the comment box.
You may also submit comments	
 Electronically through the Project Web site at http://www.cabrilloport.ene.com 	ECE
 Electronically through the Docket Management System Web s <u>http://dms.dot.gov</u>. Or by mail or email to following addresses: 	site (docket number 16877) at
	.ca.gov
All comments must be received by 2 p.m. PST,	December 20, 2004
Comments (Use other side or attach additional sheets if necessary)	Me: The electronic
This PDF document format is controlled	1
company (Adobe?) and is changed (updated) frequently.	
Software used to read PDF Siles can	become obsolete,
document. A public domain format (w	hich one I don't know G095-1
11, 111	tinued readability
farther into the Luture.	
No action will be taken until the environmental review p	process is completed.

G095-1

Thank you for the suggestion. Adobe was selected because it is available on the web for free and therefore would be available to all. Because of this level of accessibility, it was determined that it was the best choice at this time.

Date: 12/16/2004

First Name: Lisa

Last Name: West

Title: Ms.

Address: 1235 Grand Avenue

City: San Diego

State: CA

Zip Code: 92109

Email lwest858@yahoo.com

Address:

Topic: Aesthetics, Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis

Comments: It is appalling to me that some group in Malibu is opposing the Cabrillo

Port. Natural Gas pipelines are not new, untested technology - they are safe. Additionally, the pipeline will travel through the south part of Oxnard - far enough away from Malibu to be out of mind. And 14 miles offshore should not create a blight on our coast. Please count me in support of

Cabrillo Port.

2004/G049

G049-1

Date: 12/20/2004

First Name: Alan

Last Name: White

Address: 3501 Yosemite Blvd

City: Modesto

State: CA

Zip Code: 95357

Topic: Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis

Comments: Safety has been a big concern with this project, and I can uderstand why.

However, it seems to have been blown out of proportion. Everything has been brought-up from a 'ball of fire' in the sea, to a 'terrorist attack' at the port. Pipeline leaks can be a "real" concern, but BHP uses state-of-the art

technologies that will seek-out leaks to problems can be solved immediantly. As to the other concerns, they are fabricated fears that inappropriate for this situation. It's ridiculous and hope our federal

agencies will not respond to such childish remarks.

2004/G282

G282-1

Date: 12/20/2004

First Name: Dave

Last Name: Whiteneck

Topic: Other/General Comment

Comments: Based on facts listed in the EIS/EIR I support the building of Cabrillo Port.

All the research was nicely compiled and presented. I applaud BHPB for complying to and agree to midigation measures. Thank you for allowing

comment and for providing such great information to the public.

2004/G348

G348-1

Origin:

E&E Website

Date:

12/20/2004

First Name:

James

Last Name:

Whitfield

Topic:

Alternatives

Comments:

As I am sure others in the environmental community have provided ample comments related to the draft EIR/EIS, I would like to focus my comments on the area with the most glaring flaws. The alternatives analysis is totally inadequate, and does not represent a full disclosure.

First, it makes little sense that other proposed projects are dismissed out of hand. It seems to me that the merits of the BHP project can only be properly evaluated when compared to real world alternatives, rather than ones that are merely invented. This would include an analysis of the Mitsubishi, Crystal Energy, and ChevronTexaco projects.

G339-1

Yet even the invented alternatives do not receive a robust analysis that uses the criteria employed in the past by the Coastal Commission. While the draft discusses the criteria used in the old Coastal Commission siting study, it fails to mention that the BHP site was not included in that analysis. Worse, the draft fails to apply these criteria to the identified alternatives; these suggested alternatives – which are themselves inadequate – are dismissed without any real analysis.

G339-2

The draft EIR/EIS also fails to analyze adequately potential project site alternatives. While the proposed floating platform could theoretically be moored anywhere, the draft only looks at one other location, near Santa Barbara. It is totally unclear why this single site was chosen, and what criteria were used.

As a result of these glaring inadequacies, we lack a full disclosure, and this must be remedied.

2004/G339

G339-1

Chapter 3 contains additional information and an updated analysis on Project alternatives. Other proposed LNG projects in California do not represent alternatives to the proposed Project because they could occur whether or not Cabrillo Port receives a license and a lease. Section 4.20 describes and evaluates the cumulative effects of other proposed LNG projects and Cabrillo Port.

G339-2

The EIS/EIR initially evaluated 18 locations for the FSRU as potential locations for the deepwater port. It built on previous California Coastal Commission (CCC) studies that evaluated nearly 100 locations. Appendix E contains excerpts from the CCC studies. Sections 3.3.7 and 3.3.9 discuss alternate locations and technologies that were considered.

As described in Section 3.3.7.2, only sites located in water depths less than 750 feet were evaluated in the CCC's 1978 LNG Terminal Siting Study due to subsea installation constraints existing at the time. The proposed deepwater port is in approximately 2,900 feet of water and it is seaward from the Coastwise Traffic Lanes. It is also outside of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary and the Channel Islands National Park, which were not in existence at the time of the CCC studies.

Section 3.3.7.4 has been updated with additional information and siting criteria. Section 3.4.2 contains an analysis of the Ventura Flats alternative site, which was selected as the optimal location in the 1978 CCC Study. The Anacapa alternative site was also evaluated.

Both NEPA and the CEQA require the consideration of alternatives to a proposed project. A lead agency's lack of jurisdiction over a potential alternative is one factor that it may consider in determining if a potential alternative is feasible, reasonable, and merits detailed study in an EIS/EIR. Whether a potential alternative is purely hypothetical or speculative, or whether the potential alternative can be accomplished in a successful manner in a reasonable period of time are additional factors the lead agency may consider in assessing the feasibility and reasonability of the potential alternative.

From a NEPA perspective, while a Federal agency must analyze "a range of reasonable alternatives" (as opposed to any and all possible alternatives), and may be required to analyze an alternative that is outside the capability of an applicant and that is outside the jurisdiction of the agency, the threshold question in



2004/G339

determining whether to analyze any alternative is whether that alternative would be a "reasonable" alternative. Reasonable alternatives include those that are practical and feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense (CEQ 40 Questions; #2a).

To provide for an effective "hard look" at the alternatives the agency must limit the range to those alternatives that will best serve the environmental review process, and not needlessly examine and discuss in depth remote or speculative alternatives that that discussion does not facilitate a better decision making process. As stated in 40 CFR 1502.14(a), the EIS should "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated."

Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines states, in part, "[t]he Lead Agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives." The California Supreme Court in the Citizens of Goleta Valley case recognized that while an agency's jurisdiction was only one factor to consider, "[t]he law does not require in-depth review of alternatives that cannot be realistically considered and successfully accomplished." In addition, the discussion in section 15364 in the State CEQA Guidelines states that "[t]he lack of legal powers of an agency to use in imposing an alternative or mitigation measure may be as great a limitation as any economic, environmental, social, or technological factor."

Date: 12/20/2004

First Name: Jason Last Name: Wilbur

Address: 2219 Nicholl Street

City: Boulder

State: CO

Zip Code: 80304

Topic: Energy and Minerals

Comments: I am thrilled to hear about the new LNG storage facility that is being

proposed for Southern California. I believe that we are experiencing too much pressure for gas and oil drilling here in the Rocky Mountains. It is important that we conserve our own supplies instead of using them up. With the increased demand for natural gas as we move towards a cleaner, more environmentally friendly America it will be important that we have our own reserves instead of the situation we have with oil and the

Middle East.

Please approve this project as it will take pressure off our limited

reserves.

2004/G332

G332-1

Date: 12/20/2004

First Name: Doug

Last Name: Wilder

Address: P.O. Box 640

City: Alpine

State: CA

Zip Code: 91903

Topic: Socioeconomics

Comments: As a contractor, I can appreciate all of the time, energy and money that

go into a project. A project on the scale of the Cabrillo Deepwater Port is going to create a lot of jobs, both in the operation of the facility, but also in the construction too! This project will not only provide a large amount of natural gas for California, but will also provide a lot of jobs for California

families. I support the Cabrillo Deepwater Port.

2004/G362

G362-1

As a commercial fisheman that fishes in the Channel Islands waters, I am aware and concerned on my workspace...that being, Malibu to San Miguel Island. Today's high tech has come quite a bit from trial and error and the new facilities proposed appear to be something that we can live with. We don't have the problems of the old oil platforms, however, I hunt for the food you eat and talking with quite a few of my colleagues, it is a mixed feeling. We are spooked from past experiences. We are all familiar with. However, why not? We have to get resources from somewhere. As long as we learned from Mother Nature and as long as people who build these things are earnest in their endeavors, go for it! We have got to do something. Natural gas is a clean element. Let's just make sure we learned from our mistakes and anticipate the ones that will happen because they are going to happen. After all, we are only human.

2004/G521

G521-1

Date: 12/20/2004

First Name: Jarrad

Last Name: Williams

Address: 701 Elm Ave # 3
City: Grand Junction

State: CO

Zip Code: 81501

Topic: Cumulative Impacts Analysis

Comments: We should make efforts to conserve our natural resources here at home.

It is better to import from Australia than to use up our own supplies. In

addition to conserving resources at home this project should help

California to avoid future blackout crises.

Please register my support for this project.

2004/G365

G365-1

2004/G132

Origin: E&E Website

Date: 12/17/2004

First Name: John

Last Name: Williams

Address: 4773 Aberdeen St

City: San Diego

State: CA

Zip Code: 92117

Topic: Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis

Comments: California has been using natural gas for years with underground pipes all

over the place. We haven't had a major accident yet that I am aware of. This plan looks logical and makes sense to me. I support the Cabrillo

Port.

G132-1

Date: 12/22/2004

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Williams

Address: 904 Seaview Dr.
City: Imperial Beach

State: CA

Zip Code: 91932

Phone No.: 619-429-4392

Email

mwilliam@sciti.com

Address:

Topic: Energy and Minerals

Comments: My wife and I totally support the construction and operation of the Cabrillo

LNG Deepwater Port. I live near the beach and am a former Naval Officer and believe this project will have no significant environmental impact. However, it will have meet a critical need for the state to increase its supply of natural gas - a clean burning fuel source - that our growing state desparately needs. We encourage you to approve this very important

project.

2004/G404

G404-1

Date: 12/17/2004

First Name: Mildred

Last Name: Williams

Address: 10365 Tanglewood Ln

City: Descanso

State: CA

Zip Code: 91916

Topic: Socioeconomics

Comments: I am a retired widow and my only source of income is Social Security.

Most months I get by just fine, but if my electricity bill goes up, well, I just don't know what I will do. California's seniors need this project. I support

the BHP Cabrillo Deepwater Port.

2004/G124

G124-1

Date: 12/19/2004

First Name: Sondra Last Name: Wilson

Address: 6761 Freehaven Dr.

City: Sacramento

State: CA

Zip Code: 95831

Topic: Other/General Comment

Comments: BHP has a policy of environmental openess. They will have to comply

with midigation proposed in the EIR/EIS. The required measures will midigate most of the environmental impacts brought to light in the EIR/EIS. I support a company that is open and willing to work with agencies to lessen the environemental damage projects like this can create. As a state, I hope chose to move forward with Cabrillo Port. With

our growing energy needs, I see this as a win-win situation.

2004/G225

G225-

Kusano, Ken LT

USCG 2004-16877-886

From:

Damon Wing [vck@wishtoyo.org]

Sent:

Monday, December 20, 2004 4:11 PM

To:

Kusano, Ken LT; ogginsc@slc.ca.gov

Subject:

Draft EIS-EIR for Cabrillo Port LNG comments

Attachments: DW LNG Comments page1.jpg; DW LNG Comments page2.jpg; DW LNG Comments

Dear Mr. Kusano and Mr. Oggins:

Attached is the Draft EIS/EIR comments from Ventura Coastkeeper regarding noise disturbance and cumulative impacts. This letter was scanned in order that my signature would appear. Each page is its own jpg file. My apologies for any inconvenience. Hard copies have been mailed to both of you.

Best regards,

Damon Wing Programs Director Ventura Coastkeeper 3600 So. Harbor Blvd., Suite 222 Oxnard, CA 93035 (805) 382-4540





December 20, 2004

Ken Kusano (G-MSO-5) 2100 Second Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20593

Cy Oggins California State Lands Commission 100 Howe Ave., Suite 100-South Sacramento, CA 95825-8202

RE: Draft EIS/EIR for the Cabrillo Port Liquefied Natural Gas Deepwater Port
Docket Number: USCG-2004-16877
State Clearinghouse Number 2004021107
CSLC EIR No. 727

Dear Mr. Kusano and Mr. Oggins:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed Cabrillo Port Deepwater Port project and Deepwater Port License Application.

Overall this Draft EIS/EIR lacks sufficient information and analysis to assure protection of biological resources in general, and marine wildlife specifically. To address the incompleteness of this Draft, a subsequent or supplemental EIS/EIR that provides necessary information to conduct a reasonable analysis of impacts and provides adequate analysis of those impacts, including a cumulative impacts analysis, must be submitted for certification. This letter serves to illustrate two such deficiencies that should be addressed.

Section 4.7 - Biological Resources Marine

The National Marine Fisheries Service considers, as a guideline, received underwater sound pressure levels at or above 160 dB re 1 μPa as constituting harassment of marine mammals, and has suggested that underwater sound pressure levels above 180 dB re 1 μPa could cause temporary threshold shift (TTS) in marine mammals. Each time a TTS occurs, a certain degree of permanent loss can result.

G532-2

G532-1

3600 South Harbor Blvd., Ste 222 • Oxnard, CA 93035 • Phone (805) 382-4540 • Fax (805) 382-4541

2004/G532

G532-1

A Revised Draft EIR was recirculated in March 2006 under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Sections 1.4 and 1.5.3.2 contain additional information on this topic.

Federal guidance regarding the level of information required under NEPA is provided in 40 CFR 1502.22(b), which states that the EIS must include: (1) a statement that such information is incomplete or unavailable; (2) a statement of the relevance of the incomplete or unavailable information to evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment; (3) a summary of existing credible scientific evidence which is relevant to evaluating the reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment, and (4) the agency's evaluation of such impacts based upon theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community.

The State CEQA Guidelines discuss forecasting in section 15144: "Drafting an EIR or preparing a Negative Declaration necessarily involves some degree of forecasting. While foreseeing the unforeseeable is not possible, an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can." Section 15145 of the State CEQA Guidelines states, however: "If, after thorough investigation, a Lead Agency finds that a particular impact is too speculative for evaluation, the agency should note its conclusion and terminate discussion of the impact."

The document conforms to the above requirements.

G532-2

Impact BioMar-5 in Section 4.7.4 contains an updated analysis of the potential noise impacts on the marine environment. Mitigation measures, such as BioMar-5a, 5b, and 5c, have been added in addition to the Applicant Measures to reduce the potential noise impacts on the marine environment.



2

G532-2 (cont.)

G532-3

The Draft EIS/EIR states that construction vessels may remain on-site for extended periods emitting persistent noise. The range of noise from such vessels is 156 to 181 dB re 1 µPa - rms, and that dynamic pipe-laying vessels, which emit noise levels of 172 dB re 1 µPa - rms, can be heard underwater some 15 miles from the construction site. Both vessels emit noise levels beyond that which constitutes harassment of marine mammals and may exceed the level that could cause TTS in marine mammals.

Furthermore, there is insufficient information in the Draft EIS/EIR that implementation of AMMs would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The Applicant-proposed mitigation measures only include avoiding construction during migration season and monitoring. The AMMSs do not include any mitigation measures or least practicable alternatives that would reduce impacts on resident mammal communities.

Cumulative Impacts - Section 4.20.3.6 Biological Resources - Marine Impacts

The Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. § 1361) defines harassment as, "an act of pursuit, torment or annoyance which has the potential to injure, or disturb by causing disruption of behavioral patterns, a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild." Level B Harassment "has the potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption or behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering."

Underwater noise may impact marine life in three ways: 1) Masking of acoustic signals used for communication, detection of predators/prey, and navigation; 2) Affecting behavior by causing cessation of feeding, resting, mating, socializing, and alterations in alertness and avoidance; 3) Damaging the animals' physiology, such as its auditory sensitivity and thus its ability to navigate, communicate, and detect predators and prey.

Regarding marine mammal expose to noise, Dr. Darlene R. Ketten of Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution Harvard Medical School, states that "long term constant noise that disrupts a habitat or key behaviour is more likely to involve population level effects. In that sense, the question of individual hearing loss or animal loss from a single intense exposure is far less relevant to conservation than more subtle, literally quieter but pervasive source that induces broad species loss or behavioural disruption."

Gray whales, for example, are sometimes attracted vessels in breeding or calving areas, while migrating, often stay under water longer or change course in the presence of vessels.

The regularity of vessel traffic and operations of the proposed Cabrillo Prot project can create a noise disturbance that will negatively impact whale migration patterns. Other pelagic species, such as sea turtles, may be similarly be impacted, but the Draft EIS/EIR does not address noise impacts on other species.

3600 South Harbor Blvd., Ste 222 • Oxnard, CA 93035 • Phone (805) 382-4540 • Fax (805) 382-4541

2004/G532

G532-3

Section 4.7.1 contains information on background information on the marine species in the area. Impact BioMar-5 in Section 4.7.4 contains information on potential noise impacts on marine mammals. Impact BioMar-3 in Section 4.7.4 contains information on potential noise impacts on marine biota other than marine mammals, such as sea turtles. Section 4.20.3 discusses cumulative impacts within resource specific subject areas, including noise.



3

G532-4

G532-5

G532-6

The Draft EIS/EIR for this proposed project does not include any research or studies about whether animal confronted with regular or continuous industrial noise appear to deviate from their migration paths, or alter their diving patterns, or cease to vocalize, nor does this Draft EIS/EIR prescribe means of effecting the least practicable impact. It acknowledges that "Ships traveling throughout the area may produce sufficient underwater noise to cause changes in certain whale behavior" and that "such sounds may not only affect communication but also may cause whales to divert from normal migration paths or to stop feeding or reproductive activities." The Draft EIS/EIR also states that "such sounds may also reduce the abilities of marine mammals and sea turtles to detect prey or predators and, in the case of odontocetes, the ability to navigate." However, no mitigation or methods to effect the least practicable impact are offered.

The Draft EIS/EIR actually claims that action within the Point Mugu Sea Range may contribute to cumulative effects and that the proposed Cabrillo Port would lie immediately outside the Point Mugu Sea Range. It fails to adequately address its own potential contributions to the cumulative impacts. Rather it acknowledges that potential impacts exist but claims that "the incremental contribution of the proposed Project would not increase the cumulative effect of noise on marine mammals and the effect would be less than significant (Class III)."

No analysis on the proposed projects cumulative impacts is offered, and a conclusion is reached without substantiation. Adequate analysis on the potential cumulative impacts must be conducted, and if it is determined that there are any incremental contributions, they must be mitigated or at the very least reduced to their least practicable impact, including a No Project Alternative.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. Please free to contact me if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Damon G. Wing Programs Director

3600 South Harbor Blvd., Ste 222 • Oxnard, CA 93035 • Phone (805) 382-4540 • Fax (805) 382-4541

2004/G532

G532-4

Impact BioMar-5 in Section 4.7.4 contains updated information on potential noise impacts on the marine environment and mitigation measures to address such impacts.

G532-5

Section 4.20.3.7 contains an updated analysis of the potential cumulative contribution of Project-related and other offshore noise on the marine environment.

G532-6

See reponses to Comments G532-3 and G532-5.

308324

SARATOGA ENGRAVING

December 1, 2004

Mr. Cy Oggins California State Lands Commission 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South Sacramento, CA 95825

Re: Cabrillo Port LNG Terminal Docket No. USCG-2004-16877 - 4-5-3 State Clearinghouse No. 2004021107

Dear Mr. Oggins:

I am a past chairman of the Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce and a current Planning Commissioner for the City of Santa Clarita. However, for the purpose of this letter, I am acting in no official capacity representing either of these two entities. I am simply expressing my views as a local business owner and current resident with a little experience in local planning issues.

In reviewing the draft environmental report, it seems to me that the Cabrillo Port Project is an environmentally responsible energy resource project that will be extremely important to California in general and Southern California in particular.

California's State Energy Commission has indicated that despite the state's efficiency and renewable energy goals, demand for clean natural gas will continue to outstrip current supplies. If we plan on continuing the emphasis to conserve energy and to displace dirtier fossil fuels, new clean and safe sources of natural gas must be developed.

As our own area here in the Santa Clarita Valley continues to develop, our ability to attract and retain clean industry will depend on being able to insure reliable and adequate supplies of natural gas. Add to that our own city's commitment to alternative fueled vehicles and it becomes a "win-win" project for our Valley.

This increased demand for natural gas must be met. The question is: how? Cabrillo Port is the right kind of answer. This new deepwater offshore port facility will receive liquid natural gas from tankers, store it, regasify it and then deliver it via sub-sea pipeline to connect with the existing natural gas pipeline network of Southern California Gas Company.

28067 Laplante Way Santa Clarita, CA 91350 661.297, 6456 661.513,9430 FAX e-mail: mail@SaratogaEngraving.com

2004/G522

Cabrillo Port LNG Terminal December 1, 2004

Page 2.

Most of the environmental impacts identified in the draft EIR can be mitigated to less than significant levels. Most are associated with the construction phase which is both temporary and utilizes an existing right of way for a pipeline already in use through Santa Clarita.

The people and businesses of California need Cabrillo Port. It can be built while protecting the environment and can operate in a safe, efficient manner. I would encourage you to approve this important project in a most timely manner.

Sincerely,

Rick Winsman

Partner

cc: Mr. George Minter Greer/Dailey/Minter

28067 Laplante Way Santa Clarita, CA 91350 651, 297, 6456 661, 513, 9430 FAX e-mail: mail@Seratoga Engraving.com

Sholly, Brian

Source:

Letter to CSLC Commission

webuser@supportcabrillolng.com Thursday, December 16, 2004 9:31 AM

ogginsc@slc.ca.gov

To: Subject:

From:

Sent:

Comments regarding Cabrillo LNG Deepwater Port

Project.

Username: Paul Witt

UserEmail: pwitt@wittcommunications.com

UserTel:

UserFAX:

Comments:

To Lt. Ken Kusano, US Coast Guard and Cy Oggins, California State Lands Commission

Dear Sirs:

California produces less than 15% of the natural gas it consumes. Recently, energy and economic experts have raised concerns about the available supply of natural gas in California and nationwide. Those are two reasons why I am in support of the Cabrillo LNG Deepwater Port.

If developed, the Port will help California meet its growing energy needs in a safe, reliable manner with minimal environmental impacts. In addition, the construction of the Port and the pipelines will help inject needed activity into the local economy and help to provide jobs for the community.

It seems to me that BHP Billiton has taken great care in addressing environmental concerns, even down to choosing the paint color scheme of the facility to minimize visual impacts. The location of the deepwater port, 14 miles offshore, also vastly decreases safety risks for on-shore communities.

I am in favor of this project and hope that you will approve it.

Regards, Paul Witt Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed

2004/G418

Date: 12/17/2004

First Name: Connor Last Name: Wolf

Address: 1453 Slack St.
City: San Luis Obispo

State: CA

Zip Code: 93405

Topic: Other/General Comment

Comments: I was encouraged to look at the proposed LNG facilities for a class project

at Cal Poly SLO. In doing so, I learned a lot about the benefits of natural gas. I think that is something we should support coming to California.

In my opinion, the Cabrillo Port facility looked like a great proposal. It makes sense to keep the facility off shore where people don't have to look at it but it will still provide the benefits. It seems to make the most sense environmentally too.

I just wanted to write in to express my support for this project.

2004/G161

G161-1

Date: 12/20/2004

First Name: Alec

Last Name: Wood

Address: P.O. Box 711142

City: Santee

State: CA

Zip Code: 92071

Topic: Energy and Minerals

Comments: We have a great opportunity in the Cabrillo Deepwater Port project to

diversify California's supply of natural gas. A lot of profiteering at consumer expense happened in California because Enron and the like

saw an opportunity to gouge California ratepayers. The more

diversification we have the less dependent we become and therefore the

less likely we are to be taken advantage of in the future.

2004/G291

G291-1